JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE (JISC)

August 18, 2010
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Administrative Office of the Courts, SeaTac, WA

Draft Minutes

Members Present:
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Linda Bell
Chief Robert Berg
Mr. Jeff Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Ms. Siri Woods (phone)
Ms. Yolande Williams
Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Co-chair

Members Absent:
Mr. Marc Lampson
Mr. Steward Menefee
Judge Steven Rosen
Judge Michael Trickey

Guests Present:
Ms. Lynne Alfasso
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Mr. Doug Klunder
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Chris Shambro
Mr. Kevin Stock

AOC Staff Present:
Ms. Lynne Alfasso
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Eric Kruger
Mr. John O'Conner
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Call to Order

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

Approval of August Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes or comments to the draft minutes from the June 25, 2010 meeting. Hearing no comments or changes to the June minutes, Justice Fairhurst approved the June 25, 2010 minutes.

Budget Status Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported the budget allocations listed are current through June 30, 2010. All but one of the negative amounts listed on the quarter to date spreadsheet are due to timing differences. The remainder may actually be the result of underestimating the cost of Transformation Activity 2.1, Implement Change Management and Communications. There will be periodic adjustments to the allocations which will be reported on a semi-annual basis.

Currently 12.6 million is allocated to the JIS Transformation and Equipment Replacement. In 2010 we received an additional 3.7 million, of which 2.5 million was allocated directly to the Transformation project, and 1.3 million was allocated to ISD for operational staffing. The increase reflected is the 2.497 million from the last report of 10.1 million.

Expenditures and obligations are progressing at about 37% of the total allocation and about 42% of the actual transformation budget. The reports indicate allocations, expenditures, obligations and variances on a biennium-to-date and quarter-to-date basis and reflect changes to the amounts allocated.

Mr. Radwan stated that over all for a projection that was done six months prior to the biennium started, we are doing well. There will likely be another series of allocation changes in late Q3 or early Q4, after we receive information back from the Superior Court Case Management Feasibility Study.

Mr. Radwan noted to the committee that the third page of the budget report in the bound JISC meeting book was incorrect; web documents, "2b" in PDF are correct and can be found at: August 18, 2010 Meeting Material

Operational Plan Status Update

Ms. Vonnie Diseth gave the overview on the JIS Operational Plan. She reported that the new Project Management Office (PMO) SharePoint site is in production and being used by internal staff in ISD. The audience for this site is primarily the Project Management Office, but it will be used by all of AOC. The purpose of this site is to help instill industry best practices and methodologies, and consistent tools to ensure successful project delivery. It also allows for visibility into every project that is currently in process including current status.

ISD currently has two open recruitments for project managers. We are looking at existing workloads for the Transformation Initiatives, other IT projects, and the IT Governance process as the new requests start filtering through the new process; and are considering a short term option of hiring contract staff to help with managing some of our projects.

Training for the IT Governance Court Level User Group's (CLUGs) and Endorsing Groups has been completed. The IT Governance Portal went live on July 21st. The portal allows for all requests to be processed, maintained and viewed in a single location.

The calendaring and case management RFP was closed with 9 bidders responding. Management Technology Group (MTG) was the successful bidder. Contract negotiations are currently underway.

Justice Fairhurst recognized ISD staff for all the hard work that is being done and asked Vonnie to relay back to the staff her and the committee's appreciation for all they are doing.

IT Governance Process for JISC Subcommittees

Ms. Vonnie Diseth opened a discussion on the JISC sub-committees and their roles in the IT Governance process. She reported that currently the JISC has three subcommittees that have been established at various points in the past which include; the Data Dissemination Committee, the Data Management Steering Committee (DMSC), and the JIS Codes Committee. These subcommittees regularly produce IT requests for AOC to adapt and change the JIS systems to meet changing business needs.

Most requests submitted by the JISC sub-committees do not involve changes to system functionality or significant modification to system operations. These types of request are classified as "incidents", and defined as "unplanned interruptions or reductions in quality of an IT service." As such, these kinds of requests will continue to flow through AOC's established incident management process.

However, there are some requests generated by the JISC sub-committees that involve significant changes to system functionality or large investments of AOC resources. These kinds of requests are defined as "project" requests and involve addressing significant unmet business needs through enhancement of existing applications or services, acquisition of new applications or services, or replacement of existing applications or services. For all requests that fall into the "project requests" category, they are required to flow through the IT Governance process to ensure they are all evaluated and prioritized using the same methods as all other IT requests.

The IT Governance Framework specifically does not address how requests generated outside of the subcommittees are brought to those subcommittees for consideration if the subject matter of the request falls within a subcommittee's purview.

The IT Governance Framework approved by the JISC also does not define the roles and responsibilities for these JISC subcommittees. They are not included as either Endorsing bodies, like the court community associations, or as Recommending bodies, like the Court Level User Groups. Ms. Diseth points out that the IT Governance Framework does not clearly define the method for the JISC subcommittees to participate in the IT Governance process.

Ms. Diseth held a discussion with the Chairs of each subcommittee on August 11th, 2010 to discuss the IT Governance Framework. AOC along with input from the Chairs of the sub-committees has identified three alternatives for incorporating the JISC subcommittees into the IT Governance Framework. It is important to note that on March 5th, 2010 the JISC decided that requests that affect more than one court level will not go through the Recommend step, but will instead be routed directly to JISC.

Justice Fairhurst summarized by saying that in order to be true to the existing process we need to determine where these standing committees fit in the process. Justice Fairhurst made a ***motion*** that these committees act as Endorsing groups, and depending on the subject matter it would be sent to a CLUG or if it is in fact only one level or if it is multi-level it would come to the JISC. In addition, these committees need to be considered on specific requests for their feedback.

Mr. Jeff Hall explained/reminded everyone that there is a 4th CLUG – currently named AOC – where we envisioned these outside requests would end up. This CLUG has not yet been charted and finalized for members. For purposes identifying special requests this CLUG would serve as endorsers and would make the determination of direction, being back to the subcommittees for their expertise or to a specific CLUG as it relates to a single court level.

Mr. Shayne Boyd clarified that when the JISC committee previously discussed the question of things coming immediately to the JISC from another groups, (what was written in the minutes is correct). However, the follow-up discussion concluded that it wasn't what the committee wanted to occur. And it was at that point that the fourth recommending body was created. The direction for the fourth recommendation body was intended to deal with anything that did not go to one of the other three. That is how it was previously discussed and left for the charter to address.

Justice Fairhurst stated that we have three standing committee that have different functions and we want to have a process for their recommendations to be considered both for funding and approval and prioritization. Justice Fairhurst then restated her previous motion:

Motion: Any of those three committees can activate a request that gets an analysis and then depending on when they get the recommendation back if they still want to go forward and it affects only one level of court it would go to that Court Level User Group. If it affects more than one level of court then it would go to the fourth recommend body this multi-court level group (still to be named). The Chairs of the three Subcommittees (or their representatives) would serve on this fourth level user group. This will ensure we have the benefit of their expertise and nothing gets lost. This will also cover lower funding cost requests that due to the dollar amount would never get to the JISC and could go through a lower approval level.

Second: Mr. N.F. Jackson, Motion passed unanimously.

JIS Policy on IT Governance

Ms. Vonnie Diseth presented the final draft of the IT Governance Policy. The latest changes were as a result of feedback from the June 25 JISC meeting. There is one change that has come as a result of the previous agenda discussion on IT Governance Process for JISC subcommittees, these being the Data Management Steering Committee, Data Dissemination Committee and the Code Committee. These three committees will be added to Appendix A as endorsing groups.

Justice Fairhurst suggested adding an Appendix B – which shows the three court level user groups and the Multi-Court Level/Non-Court initiated request group.

Motion: Mr. N.F. Jackson - to adopt IT Governance Policy as stated in material with the above mentioned inclusions. Second: Yolande Williams. Motion passed unanimously.

GR 30 Amendment – Officer Signatures on Citations

As carried from the June 25 JISC meeting, Judge James Heller summarized and clarified the processes for electronic filing use of signatures and also the need to address a secondary problem with the language of RCW 9A.72.

By amending the language of RCW 9A.72 to read:

Any document initiated by a law enforcement officer is presumed to have been signed when the officer uses his or her user id and password to electronically submit the document to a court or prosecutor through the Statewide Electronic Collision & Traffic Online Records application, the Justice Information Network Data Exchange, or a local secured system that the presiding judge designates by local rule. Unless otherwise specified, the signature shall be presumed to have been made under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington and on the date and at the place set forth in the citation.

Changing the language will clear up both items. It presumes that if the police officer or someone with a user id and password that are signing, it is presumed to be under the penalty of perjury, and that the place and date in the citation for documentation. This was sought by Traffic Safety and Department of Licensing, and other agencies. It moves us forward on substantive issues instead of technical objections that were created in the gap.

Motion: Chief Bob Berg made motion to accept: I move that the JISC recommend the amendment of GR 30 to the Supreme Court, 1) removing the requirement that a law enforcement officer must have applied for a password from an electronic filing service provider, and 2) providing that electronic documents initiated by law enforcement and submitted to a court or prosecutor through SECTOR or a secured system approved by the presiding judge are presumed signed by the officer on the date and in the place set forth in the citation.

Second: Judge James Heller, Motion passed unanimously.

Case Management System Readiness Review

Mr. Shayne Boyd presented the results from the vendor demonstrations that took place in March of 2010. Viewing the current solutions available in the market allowed AOC to update the 2007 market study previously done and develop a limited market profile to assist stakeholder assessments.

This assessment provides JISC with a consolidated dataset about the four solution categories for case management and calendaring. The assessment of readiness should prove advantageous in subsequent efforts to address the business needs of the courts.

The complete report can be found in the meeting packet.

EA – Future State Architecture

As part of the JISC approved Transformation, AOC initiated a series of key initiatives. One of those initiatives is Enterprise Architecture Management (EAM), which provides a foundational framework that aids in the planning and management of information technology resources that supports the business of the courts. Enterprise Architecture provides holistic thinking and guidance for meeting complex statewide IT business needs. EAM also involves adopting a common set of standards that facilitates information sharing among systems and applications.

On May 19, 2010, the JISC approved a set of Enterprise Architecture Principles to guide the development of the Enterprise Architecture Management framework and ensure alignment with JISC priorities. Based on those principles, the Enterprise Architecture team has developed a Future State Architecture to guide future IT decisions for the Judicial Information System (JIS).

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam presented the Future State Architecture. Mr. Yajamanam stated that this information will be used to build the framework to use on an ongoing basis to set the foundation for the Future State Architecture. He presented a series of diagrams and relationships of how the foundational architecture looks presently and in the future and what will be needed to reach the future state The presented model allows us to be flexible to adhere to legislative mandates and other changes as technology and business needs grow and evolve. A key component of the future state is standardization. We want to be sure our business practices are standardized and that our businesses are integrated. Our next steps:

1. The Enterprise Architecture team will develop additional IT standards and policies supporting the new technical architecture.
2. The Enterprise Architecture team will participate in the work group that will make recommendations to the JISC for determining “baseline” functional capabilities.

The complete Technical White Paper and presentation is included in the meeting packet.

Motion: Chief Bob Berg - I move that the JISC adopt the proposed Future State Technical Architecture as presented in Section 4 of the Foundation for Modern Judicial Information Systems in Washington State.

Second: Mr. Jeff Hall, members present voted in favor, Yolande Williams abstained.

Committee Reports

Mr. Rich Johnson reported that ten courts have been identified and confirmed as participating in the first production rollout of the Vehicle Related Violations project. Each court has been vetted for readiness and the vendor is doing some scaling of the application to be sure we can support a large number of additional courts.

Work is continuing on the Superior Court Data Exchanges. Requirements on phase one and phase two have been finalized. The LINX data exchange interface is being built at this time. Work is moving forward as scheduled.

Special September Session

A special JISC session has been scheduled for October 1, 2010 for the specific purpose of doing a table-top exercise of the prioritization process that the JISC will undertake in the IT Governance Framework process.

Agenda Items carried to October

#10. ISD Overview

Next Meeting

The next regular JISC meeting will be October 27, 2010, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Adjournment

Being out of time the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.